



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/614,174	07/08/2003	Keiichi Takashima	00862.023125.	6463
5514	7590	12/13/2005	EXAMINER	
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO			BLACKWELL, JAMES H	
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			ART UNIT	
NEW YORK, NY 10112			PAPER NUMBER	

2176

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/614,174	Applicant(s) TAKASHIMA, KEIICHI	
	Examiner James H. Blackwell	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/14/03, 6/22/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to an original application filed 07/08/2003 with a priority date of **07/09/2002**.
2. Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown (hereinafter Brown, "Using Netscape Communicator 4, Special Edition", Que Corporation, Copyright 1997)

In regard to independent Claims 1 (and similarly Claims 2, and 3), Brown teaches *a form processing device for reading a field data file storing data to be overlaid onto a defined field in a form, and overlaying data of the field data file onto a field in the form* in that the Netscape Communicator Browser can access previously entered and stored/cached inputs to the form field named Location (see p. 112, Fig. 8.1). The History data file/cache contains a list of previous entries (pp. 133-135).

Brown also teaches *a determination means for determining, if the data of the field data file is description specifying an external file, whether the description of the data is in a URL format* in that the Location field has the capability of automatically completing

addresses for you. If for some reason the History list contains previous inputs not in a proper form for the browser (URL or URL-like syntax such as http:// or ftp:// or even www) then the browser will attempt to auto complete the address from the previously entered content in the History list/cache. If on the other hand, one enters content indicative of a file path (c:, file///, etc.) the Location field assumes the user wants to load a file which is resident on the local computer, or a local disk (p. 123). Thus, Brown at the very least suggests that determination of whether the data of the field data file is an external file and a URL would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention since the auto completion feature of the Location field of the browser can determine whether or not the input to the Location field is in fact a URL or, for example, a pathname to a local file, allowing the user to obtain content that is located on, for example, a network like the internet.

Brown also teaches *overlaying means for downloading the external file from a network server in compliance with Internet protocols, and overlaying the data of the downloaded external file onto the field in the form if the description is determined to be in a URL format by the determination means* in that once a proper looking URL has been entered via the auto completion feature of the Location field and that value has been submitted, that the content associated with the input URL is loaded into the browser for display to the user (p. 123). It is noted that this feature is well known in the art of browsers and of browsing the web.

In regard to dependent Claim 4, Brown teaches a storing step of storing the external file downloaded based on a predetermined URL from the server, into a local

drive in association with the URL in that the Netscape browser caches downloaded content associated with URLs to disk and/or memory (p. 127). Netscape offers a settings feature to allow the user to manage the caches of the browser.

Brown does not go into detail about overwriting cached content, as suggested by the limitation that *the URL does not correspond to any of URLs of the external files stored at the storing step*. However, whether or not to overwrite, refresh or flush a cache is well known in the art and would be considered an obvious feature to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention.

In regard to dependent Claim 5, Though Brown does not go into detail related to cache management based on the age of stored content as depicted by the limitation that *if the time stamp of the external file stored at the storing step is older than the time stamp of the external file in the network server specified in the field data file, even if the description is determined to be in a URL format at the determination step and the URL corresponds to the URL of the external file stored at the storing step*, such features would have been well known and obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention. In addition, such a feature is suggested by Brown (see p. 127, Fig. 8.15) in that cached documents are compared to network documents by some frequency set by the user and that at least the user can refresh the cache with a newer version of the document in question.

In regard to dependent Claim 6, Claim 6 reflects the device, method and program as depicted in Claims 1-5 and is rejected along the same rationales.

In regard to dependent Claim 7, Claim 7 reflects the device, method and program as depicted in Claims 4-5 and is rejected along the same rationales.

In regard to dependent Claims 8-9, Brown teaches *the storing step stores the downloaded external file in the local drive if it is smaller than a predetermined file capacity and the storing step deletes an external file stored in the local drive if the file capacity of the downloaded external file is larger than the free space of the local drive* (p. 127, Fig. 8.15 defines limits to the size of the browser caches).

In regard to dependent Claim 10, Claim 10 reflects the device, method and program as depicted in Claims 1-5 and is rejected along the same rationales.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H. Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

6. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
12/07/2005

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
12/9/2005